REMARKS

After entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 3-5 and 17-31 remain pending in the application.

The *Response to Arguments* section of the Action states:

> Regarding Claims 1, 3-5, and 17-31 applicant argued that "the step of connecting is done under the control of the intermediate node and not by a user at the user node or by the any action at the user node ... user cannot prevent this from happening ... prevent such connection."[1]

Applicants are unsure where the Office finds this quoted language. It does not seem to appear in the arguments submitted with the last Amendment. Clarification is solicited.

The Action failed to address, in the *Response to Arguments* section, the arguments that applicants *did* submit with the last amendment. For example, as regards claim 1, applicants explained:

> Hudetz is understood to operate by reading a UPC bar code from an item (e.g., a can of soup), passing the barcode data to a database that maps the UPC code to a URL, and then accessing information from the mapped URL.
>
> In some cases, the barcode data Hudetz passes to the database isn't the complete UPC barcode, but is, e.g., only the manufacturer ID portion of the complete code. In this case, the data passed to the database may yield *several* matching URLs – one for each product manufactured by the manufacturer. For example, if the manufacturer ID "31251" is passed to the database shown in Fig. 4, Hudetz's system would return URLs from the 3 records that contain "31251". See Hudetz at col. 8, lines 53-64.[2]
>
> Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the "additional objects" do not have "the same object identifier sent from the first device to the second device." This distinguishes Hudetz, in which all of the "additional objects" for which URL information is returned have *the same* identifier sent from the first device to the second device (e.g., "31251" in the cited example).

---

[1]   December 15, 2005, Action, page 2, first sentence of last paragraph.

[2]   The reference to records 61, 64 and 65 at col. 8, line 62 is believed to be in error, and should be 62, 64 and 66. (Reference numerals 61 and 65 do not appear in the Hudetz drawings.)

In the latest Action, the Office alleges that Hudetz teaches all limitations of claim 1. However, e.g., Hudetz does not teach an arrangement in which the "additional objects" do <u>not</u> have "the same object identifier sent from the first device to the second device." Rather, Hudetz teaches an arrangement in which all of the "additional objects" for which URL information is returned have *the same* identifier sent from the first device to the second device (e.g., "31251").

The Office is requested to consider the points and claim amendments made in the last Amendment concerning claims 1, 3-5 and 17-22, since these issues do not seem to have been given proper consideration in the most recent Action.

Independent claim 23 is also rejected over Hudetz. However, the Action failed to address the limitation in claim 23 requiring that the "identifying additional objects" occurs "<u>after</u> initiating said link." Hudetz does not teach this.

Likewise, independent claim 24 requires anticipatorily sending address information associated with foreseen object payloads "<u>after</u> initiating said electronic link." Hudetz does not teach this.

Similarly, claims 30 and 31 include limitations – relating to foreseeing an order in which object payloads may be forthcoming – that are not taught by Hudetz.

For brevity's sake, the foregoing discussion has reviewed just certain of the claims pending in the application, and only selected points have been reviewed in connection with each. Many other points that might have been raised concerning the claims, the art, and the rejections, have not been belabored.

Claims 28 and 31 stand rejected under § 112, first paragraph. The Action alleges that the term "a bound volume" is not described in the specification.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. The claim term is supported by the specification's reference to books and magazines (see, e.g., page 3, line 2) – both of which are "bound volumes."

Favorable reconsideration and passage to issuance are solicited.

Date: March 14, 2006

CUSTOMER NUMBER 23735

Phone: 503-469-4800
FAX 503-469-4777

Respectfully submitted,

DIGIMARC CORPORATION

By_____
            William Y. Conwell
            Registration No. 31,943